EXHIBIT 3

Excerpts from Transcript

1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK Case No. 09-50026 In the Matter of: MOTORS LIQUIDATION COMPANY, ET AL., f/k/a General Motors Corp, et al. Debtors. United States Bankruptcy Court One Bowling Green New York, New York November 5, 2009 9:50 AM B E F O R E: HON. ROBERT E. GERBER U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

2.0

is to permit his claim to be liquidated in another forum. But it has the consequences of requiring the estate to defend the claim in an inefficient fashion.

In my experience, impact of the stay on the parties and the balance of harms, factor number 12, is one of the most important. Here nobody is going to be depriving Mr. Lawrence of his day in court. The issue, rather, is which court will decide the issues.

As we've now established I have subject matter jurisdiction to decide a routine matter of claims allowance and to address all of Mr. Lawrence's needs and concerns insofar as he's looking for relief from this debtor. Frankly, based upon my understanding of the nonbankruptcy law, if and to the extent he has claims, they're more likely to exist against the separate defendant, the trust, rather than this debtor but I'll give him a fair day in court to decide these issues if he wishes to proceed with them in the claims context.

Bankruptcy litigation is typically as efficient or more efficient than litigation in the district courts in connection with plenary litigation. And the very reason that we have a claims allowance process is to deal with these matters, subject to rights of appeal of course, in the most economical way possible.

Conversely, if the estate has to go through the burden of litigation elsewhere and the estate is paying full

212-267-6868 516-608-2400

2.0

connection, in connection with several of the factors, I do have to note that if I were ever to allow relief from the stay on a garden variety claim of this type there would indeed be the risk, if not the certainty, that every other party who thinks he or she has a good claim against the estate pending in another jurisdiction would be asking me to defend -- to provide relief from the stay and require the debtors to be litigating claims of this character all over the country. The floodgates concern that the estate articulated is indeed a very serious one.

So for the foregoing reasons the motion is denied. The debtors are to settle an order in accordance with the foregoing. The order should not attempt to encapsulate everything I said in this lengthy, dictated decision. It should merely provide that for the reasons set forth in this decision the motion is denied.

Not by way of reargument, do we have anything that I failed to address? Mr. Lawrence?

MR. LAWRENCE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I can't allow you to reargue the motion or to debate my decision except by taking it up on appeal, but I will allow you to tell me if you think I have any business that I didn't address today.

MR. LAWRENCE: Any what, sir?

THE COURT: Business.

212-267-6868 516-608-2400